

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated July 22, 2009 in which the Examiner rejected claims 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e).

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the explanation found on page 2 of the Office Action.

As indicated above, claims 12-15 have been amended in order to make explicit what is implicit in the claim. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Claim 12 claims an information process apparatus, claim 13 claims an information process method, claim 14 claims a program for a process that controls an information process apparatus and claim 15 claims a computer-readable medium. The apparatus, method, program and medium include generating reproduction history information, each composed of (a) identification information of reproduced material data, (b) information about a reproduction end position and (c) information about a type of reproduction method. The types of reproduction methods include at least a tape-like reproduction method that successively reproduces all clips recorded on the recording medium, a clip designation reproduction method that reproduces a designated clip and an edit list designation reproduction method that reproduces a designated unit of an edit list.

By (a) having each reproduction history information include information about a type of reproduction method and (b) having the types of reproduction methods include at least a tape-like reproduction method, a clip designation reproduction method, and an edit list designation reproduction method as claimed in claims 12-15, the claimed invention provides an information processing apparatus, method, program and medium which can record a reproduction history of various types of reproduction methods for material data on the disks, use the reproduction history

in the next reproduction process and resume the reproduction from the last reproduction stop position. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest recording a reproduction history of various types of reproduction methods as claimed in claims 12-15.

Claims 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by *Kikuchi, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,532,334).

Kikuchi, et al. appears to disclose a playback interrupt information table 124 of Figure 6 which is a table in which playback interruption information is to be written when a user interrupts the playback. As shown in Figure 9, the table 124 includes the time of the interruption, the title number of the title whose playback has been interrupted, the part-of-the-title number at which the playback has been interrupted, the PGC (program chain information table) number at which the playback has been interrupted, the program number in the PGC whose playback has been interrupted, the cell ID, the ID of the video object unit (column 11, lines 24-35). When the playback picture is a still picture, the time the still picture lasts and the remaining time of the still picture during the interruption of the playback are written. In addition, the elapsed time in reproducing a cell is written as interrupt information (column 11, lines 44-48). The MPU of the microcomputer block 30 uses the RAM as a work area according to the control programs stored in the ROM and functions as if it had a playback end information setting section 30A for determining playback end information (column 15, lines 5-9).

Thus, *Kikuchi, et al.* merely discloses a playback interrupt information table which includes the time of the interruption, the title number, the part at which playback was interrupted, a program chain information table number, a program number in the PGC whose playback has been interrupted, the cell ID and the ID of the video object unit. Nothing in *Kikuchi, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests (a) each reproduction history information includes information about

a type of reproduction method and (b) the types of reproduction methods includes at least a tape-like reproduction method, a clip designation reproduction method and an edit list designation reproduction method as claimed in claims 12-15. Rather, *Kikuchi, et al.* merely discloses a playback interrupt information table containing information about the interruption.

Furthermore, *Kikuchi, et al.* merely discloses that at the time of interruption, writing into the playback interrupt information table the part-of-title number at which the playback has been interrupted. Applicants respectfully point out that the part of the title that the interrupt occurs is not a type of reproduction method. In the claimed invention, one of a plurality of types of reproduction methods is included in the reproduction history information. Nothing in *Kikuchi, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests including information about a type of reproduction method where the reproduction methods include at least a tape-like reproduction method, a clip designation reproduction method and an edit list designation reproduction method as claimed in claims 12-15.

Since nothing in *Kikuchi, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests (a) each reproduction history information includes information about a type of reproduction method and (b) the types of reproduction methods include at least a tape-like reproduction method, a clip designation reproduction method and an edit list designation reproduction method as claimed in claims 12-15, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e).

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for a reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.


In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

Date: September 22, 2009

By: 
Ellen Marcie Emas
Reg. No. 32,131
(202) 292-1530